UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,545	08/24/2001	Stephan Hartwig	1123.40573X00	8708

20457 7590 11/24/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER	
FLEARY, CAROLYN FATIMAH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,545	HARTWIG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carolyn F. Fleary	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date April 19, 2002.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Objection to Abstract

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to due to use of legal phraseology "means" (line 5). See MPEP 608.01b. Correction is required.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Objection to Specifications

2. The arrangement of sections of the specifications is objected to due to non-adherence to preferred layout. The following section headings are missing: 1) Background of the Invention 2) Brief Summary of Invention 3) Detail Description of Invention. (See MPEP 6.01 & 6.02)

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following elements, if applicable, order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading (See MPEP 6.01):

(1) Title of the invention, which may be accompanied by an introductory portion stating the name, citizenship, and residence of the applicant (unless included in the application data sheet).
(2) Cross-reference to related applications (unless included in the application data sheet).
(3) Statement regarding federally sponsored research or development.
(4) Reference to a "Sequence Listing," a table, or a computer program listing appendix submitted on a compact disc and an incorporation-by-reference of the material on the compact disc (see § 1.52(e)(5)). The total number of compact discs including duplicates and the files on each compact disc shall be specified.
(5) Background of the invention.
(6) Brief summary of the invention.
(7) Brief description of the several views of the drawing.
(8) Detailed description of the invention.
(9) A claim or claims.
(10) Abstract of the disclosure.
(11) "Sequence Listing," if on paper

3. The use of the trademark Bluetooth ™ has been noted in this application (Pg 5-line 25, Pg 1-line 33). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks. (See MPEP 608.01(v) [R-2] I.)

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "installation bus gateway" as disclosed in claims 12 and 13 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: The component (10) is mention twice using different labels. "Pluggable server (10) " line 6 and "installation gateway (10)" line 7. The "installation gateway" is not labeled in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The component (20) is mention twice using different labels. "Installation gateway (10)" line 11 and "user interface device (20)". The "installation gateway" is not labeled in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

a. Claim 4, 5, 12,13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

i. Regarding claim 4, claim 4 recites the limitation "said device control logic" in line 19 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

ii. Regarding claim 5, claim 5 recites the limitation "said device remote control logic" in line 21-22 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this

limitation in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

iii. Regarding claim 12, the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) "code" (line 6) in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

iv. Regarding claim 13, the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) "code" (line 9) in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

Claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

a. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

i. Claim 12 recites "Computer Program" (line 1), "comprising program code" (line 2) are non-statutory. Abstract ideas or the mere manipulation of abstract ideas, are not patentable. The computer program being claimed is not part of a statutory manufacture or machine. The computer program code and computer program code are merely a sets of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program and computer program code itself is not a process and therefore is as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. (See MPEP 2106 [R-2] IV, B. 1 (a).)

ii. Claim 13 recites Computer Program product, comprising program code means stored on a computer readable material (lines –2) are non-statutory. When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory. (See MPEP 2106 [R-2] IV, B. 1 (b))

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

a. Claim 1, 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato (US 2001/0184385).

i. In regards to Claim 1 Kato, discloses Pluggable server module, for remote controlling of a device comprising :

- a wireless transceiver ([0008, [0053], [0101]) [1023] lines 11-14 [0003-0004, [0067])
- a computing means [0100]
- a server remote control logic [0302]
- a standardized interface and a connector for connecting to said device, ([0100] [0105][0187])
- wherein said wireless transceiver connected to a computing means (([0084]- line 3) Claim 1])
- said computing means is connected to said server remote control logic ([0302]) and,
- said server remote control logic is connected to said standardized interface and said connector . ([0302])

Although Kato is teaches remote computing means and remote control logic and standardized interface and connector, Kato is silent on how the connections are. Howe ever the 1) the connection between the computing means and server remote control logic are deemed to be inherent to the Kato device as [0302] shows that and external device may be operated from the device and [0084] indicates that the computing means drives the components of the device. 2) The connection between the server remote control logic and standard interface and connector are deemed to be inherent to the Kato device as [0032]-line 4-7) shows that an a external device may be operate from the device by providing the data needed for its operation. The Kato

device would be inoperative without the computing means to drive both the functionality or the standard interface and connector use to transmit and receive information from an external device.

b. In Regards to claim 2, further comprising:

- wireless protocol stack sever connected between said wireless transceiver and said computing means (fig 5, [0141] lines 4-7, [0166] lines 16-26, [0141], [0324]).

Although Kato teaches the wireless protocol stack server, wireless transceiver and computing means, Kato is silent on how the components are connected. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Kato system as [0141] lines 7 show that the wireless protocol stack directs operation of the wireless transceiver system, which as per claim 1 is connected to the computing means.

c. In Regards to claim 3, further comprising:

- a storage means connected to said computing means for storing user interface data ([0098], [0100].

Although Kato teaches the storage means for storing user interface data and computing means, Kato is silent on how both components are connected. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Kato system as [0098] lines 1-6 indicate that information collected by Kato's device may are redistributed to a portable device for use and lines [0100] indicates memory provides storage for various programs run and accessed by the computing means.

d. Claim 4 is indefinite because line 19 recites "said device control logic" which lacks appropriate antecedent basis. For the purposes of the following art rejection, the "device control logic" is being interpreted as the "control logic".

Claim 5 is indefinite because line 21 recites "said device remote control logic" which lacks appropriate antecedent basis. For the purposes of the following art rejection, the "device remote control logic" is being interpreted as the "control logic".

e. Claim 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kirkpatrick (US 2002/0186618).

ii. In Regards to claim 4 Kirkpatrick discloses a Device, comprising:

- a logic element wherein the device is characterized by a standardized interface and connector for connecting to a pluggable server, (Figure 2, [0020] line 4, 16-17) and
- a control logic [0025] lines 2,4-6, wherein said standardized interface and said connector are connected to said control logic,
- and said device control logic is connected to said logic element (Figure 2,[0020] line 7)

iii. In Regards to claim 5, Kirkpatrick teaches further comprising:

- storage means connection to said device remote control logic for storing user interface data. (Figure 2, [0020] lines 5, 10)

Kirkpatrick discloses a device (Alarm Clock), which contains logic (control module, processing device, device operation hardware) that is adapted to receive commands to control its general operation from a remote location ([0020], lines 16-18, [0025])). The device

contains a standard interface and connector (network interface) that is adapted to receive remote commands that control the operation of the device ([0024] lines 11-15). Commands sent to the control module via the network interface such that the control module can configure the device to perform the received command ([0008]). Figure 1 illustrates the connection (local interface) made between the control logic and interface as well as the logic element (device operation hardware). Kirkpatrick also discloses the device storage (memory) used for storing user interface data (commands) to be executed by the control logic, which in turn facilitates the operation of the device. [0025]

f. Claim 6, 7, 8,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rezvani et al. (US 2003/0140107).

i. In Regards to claim 6, Rezvani et al. discloses a method for remote controlling of a device ([0004]-lines 1-3, [0054]-lines 1-14, [0056]) by a wireless remote control terminal ([0038] lines 9-10) via a wireless link ([0039-lines 5-11, [0050]-line 7), a pluggable server connected to said device via a standardized interface and a connector ([0051]-lines 1-10,[0052], lines 6-15) ([0057], lines 1-6) comprising the steps of:

- transferring a content request ([0064] lines 6-8, [0066] lines 1-2]) by wireless protocol stack via said wireless link ([0042], [0062]-lines 15-19) from said wireless remote control terminal to said pluggable server [0057]- lines 3-6)
- invoking the desired remote command in device ([0060]-lines 9-12) by using a communication protocol on the standardized

interface and connector ([0040]-lines 8-10), the remote command being triggered, specified and parameterized by said content request to the pluggable server ([0005-0006], [0042][0078]);

- executing said command in said device; [0060, lines 9-12]
- communicating the result of the remote command execution in said device from said device to said pluggable server ([0062]-lines 11-15, [0080])
- creating a corresponding response page in said pluggable server [0074] lines 5-13]; [0042] and
- transmitting and displaying said corresponding response page on the remote control terminal ([0042] ,[0053] lines 4-6[0075]-lines 7-16, , [0077] lines 1-6, [0080]) .

Although Rezvani et al. teaches content transferred from a remote terminal to a pluggable server module (monitoring module), Rezvani et al. is silent on the pluggable server module ~~and~~ use of the wireless protocol stack. However these features are deemed to be inherent to the Rezvani et al. system section [0039 –00 41] show that the remote site and a module communicate via a wireless communication using the Bluetooth, or HTTP communication protocol. Where the remote site is the master controller and includes remote user access devices ([0050]). it is also shown that a module can serve as an interface between a remote site and at least one connected device. Where the module may be a stand-alone device connected to a remote site (i.e. PDA, mobile phone) via a wireless link ([0051]). In addition the

module servers as a translation or brokering agent between a remote site and the device being controlled ([0059])

Although Rezvani et al. teaches a standard interface Rezvani et al. is silent on standard interface and connector, However these features are deemed to be inherent to the Rezvani et al. system section [0053] shows that a device may be interfaced and capable of being controlled ([0054)].

ii. In Regards to claim 7, Rezvani et al. disclose further comprising steps of:

- Transferring user interface content and/or auxiliary content interface by a wireless protocol stack from said pluggable server to said wireless remote control terminal, that may contain among others a set of commands for controlling said device or said pluggable server via said wireless link ([0041-0042]);
- Displaying said contents on a display in said wireless remote control terminal ([0042])

iii. In Regards to claim 8, Rezvani et al. disclose further comprising steps of:

- Selecting one of the commands in said terminal by a user input ([0064] lines 6-8) and;
- Displaying said contents on a display [0087] in said wireless remote terminal [0077-0078].

iv. In regards to claim 9, Rezvani et al. discloses a method for transferring user interface data for preparing the remote controlling of a

device by means of a pluggable server module, from said device to said pluggable server module (abstract lines 1-5), comprising the steps of:

- detecting a pluggable server module connected to a standardized interface and a connector of said device ([0061] lines 4-7, [0140-0141] ;
- retrieving said user interface data ([0060] [0076]) from a storage means([0058]) of said device
- transferring said user interface data to said pluggable server module via said standardized interface and said connector ([0060] lines 1-4).

Although Rezvani et al. teaches the detection of pluggable server module (monitoring module), Rezvani et al. is silent on the connection. However this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Rezvani et al. system as section [0140] shows automatic detection allows devices coupled to modules to be automatically detected.

Although Rezvani et al. teaches user interface data and the pluggable sever module, Rezvani et al. is silent on the transfer of the user interface data to the pluggable server. However this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Rezvani et al. system as section [0060] shows is loaded with data from a device. The Rezvani et al. system would not be able to allow for remote control of a device if the user interface data wee not transferred to the pluggable server module.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

~~a.~~ Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Rezvani (US 2002/0140107) further in view of Bender (US 6,671,735)

i. In Regards to claim 10 Rezvani et al. discloses a method for retrieving user interface data for preparing the remote controlling of a device by means of a pluggable server module, comprising the steps of:

- requesting device identifying information from said device, containing at least device and manufacturer related information; ([0060], [0061] lines 1-4)
- receiving and storing said device identifying information in said pluggable server module', ([0060] lines 4-5)
- transferring said device identifying information to a network access point which may be the remote control terminal itself;([0094- 0096])
- Transferring said device identifying information from said Network Access Point to a communication network; ([0094- 0096])
- Receiving said user interface data by response from said communication network ;([0094- 0096])
- storing said user interface data in said pluggable server module. ([0094, lines 1-4)

Rezvani et al. fails to explicitly teach the transferring of device identifying information to a network access point (NAP) and network access point (NAP) receipt of user interface data from a communication network. Rezvani et al. only acknowledges the receipt of the user interface a communication network.

Bender teaches that device-identifying data, as indicated by the Rezvani et al. system, is first sent to a NAP from a user terminal. Once received, the network access point assigns and sends a user terminal an IP address so that it can be identified on a network Bender teaches that this is done such that a user terminal may communicate with any other entity on a network. During the communication, a NAP parses the data and creates an IP packet, containing source and designation IP information, to a packet router, which is connected to a communication network (designation IP). The communication networks are also assigned IP addresses by the NAP.

One of ordinary skill in the art that would understand the advantages of implementing the network access point of Bender with the transmission of the device id information and user interface retrieval of Rezvani et al.. Bender teaches that it desirable for mobile user terminals to maintain connectivity to a communication network. The assignment of the IP address from the transfer of data to the initial NAP is advantageous because it allows other NAPs, which the user terminal communicates with due to its mobility, to be able to retrieve and send data to/from a communication network and avoid re initiating a connection. Thereby making the method of the user interface retrieval and storage of Rezvani more efficient and reliable. (See Bender col

1: lines 25-30, col 2 lines 64-67, col 3 lines 1-3, col 4 lines 19-32, col 4 lines 45-50, col 5 lines 12- 31, (col 5 lines 27-31)., col 6 lines 12-14).

b. Claim 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Rezvani (US 2002/0140107) over Bender (US 6,671,735) further in view of Rudd et al. (US 6,178,468):

i. In regards to claim 11 as modified above, Rudd et al. discloses a method wherein the transfer of said device identifying information from said remote control terminal to said communication network is executed by:

- Transferring said device-identifying information first to an Internet access point via a telephone network (col 4 lines 65-67), and then
- Transferring said device-identifying information from said Internet access point to said communication network via Internet. (col 4 lines 10-11, 16-18)

The method of Rezvani et al. and Bender, as described above, fails to disclose a telephone network as a means to transfer the device to an Internet access point.

Rudd teaches alternate sources (URL, BBS, LAN, WAN) may be used to retrieve installation resources (col 4 lines 60-68) where the structure and logic remains the same.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have recognized the telephone network component (BBS) of Rudd as another method, to transport device id information of claim 11, as modified above, to access an access point. This would allow for efficiency, convenience and real time mechanism, instead of requiring a module to be pre-supplied

with user interface data and allow the claim 11, as modified above, system to leverage the plug and play functionality of the Rudd system. (See Rudd col 2 lines 25-44)

Conclusion

The following cited art relates to electronic devices/systems capable of being controlled remotely:

- Clayton et al (US 6,771,173): Alarm device for monitoring personnel presence containing remote logic, device logic as wells a network interface to allow for remote control.
- Carney (US 6,366,648): Alarm system capable of remote control via a telephone line and answering machine. Alarm system-containing memory, logic.

The following cited art relates to systems that contain independent/portable server-like devices for remote controlling of a device.

- Anderson et al (US 6,633,905): Computer access and operation via a remote access device by a remote computer.
- Breh et al. (US 2004/0054747): Network appliance for controlling home devices in a home network via mobile devices.
- Chang (US 2004/0127254): Communication device for wireless communication between devices. The communication device allowing for wireless printing.

- Finke et al. (US 2002/0156860): Personal server system, which allows monitoring and access to consumer electronic devices via a remote control.
- Fu et al. (US 2004/0164621): Pluggable mechanism for wireless remote control. Pluggable unit
- La et al. (US 2004/0145468): Portable home server controls data transmission and reception of an internal network to which a plurality of home appliances are connected in a home.
- Paroz (US 6,587,125): Control of a first device via a second device via a mediator
- Singkornrat (US 6,128,484): Wireless transceivers for remotely controlling a computer

The following cited art relates to direct remote control access to a device via the Internet from a remote source.

- Backer et al. (US 2002/0091784): Remote access to a device connected to the Internet via a web browser.
- Chang et al. (US 2003/0129944): System and method of monitoring and controlling a remote device operative in accordance with Bluetooth™ protocols.
- Eranko (US 6,801,934): Access to data stored on a data server via a network interface.
- Hoffman et al. (US 2001/0020255): Remote control and interaction to a device via a lightweight device such as mobile device, laptop or web browser.
- Isham (US 2002/0077114): System control of devices through portable wireless terminals.

The following cited art relates to remote controls

- Ben-Ze'ev (US 6,791,467): Control of a plurality of appliances via remote control.
- Colmenzrez (US 2004/0208588): Remote control that automatically configures itself to a device by using device identification.

The following cited references relates to sending/receiving information wirelessly to a remote source.

- Boals et al. (US 6,108,727) System for compressing files and transmitting files to a wireless device via a wireless link.
- Herle et al. (US 2003/0186689): A wireless communication device capable of being upgraded from a software upgrade server via a wireless communication network.

The following art relates to automatic detection of devices.

- Brockway et al. (US 6,789,111): Server-client system configured to automatically detects and installs devices attached to a client.
- Kenagy et al. (US 2004/0110504): System and method for handshaking between wireless devices and servers.
- Parthasarathy (US 6,347,398): Method and system to automatically locate, download, verify, install and register and display computer software component from a computer network like the Internet or intranet.
- Wittel, Jr. et al. (US 2003/0195951): Dymanic detection, downloading, and install of drivers from an online services

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn F. Fleary whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, GLENTON BURGESS can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Carolyn F Fleary
Examiner
Art Unit 2152

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner